

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/964,060	09/26/2001	Anthony Baerlocher	406470 1422	
75	90 10/23/2003		EXAMINER	
George H. Gerstman			ENATSKY, AARON L	
Seyfarth Shaw			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
55 East Monroe Street, Suite 4200			ARTONII	PAPER NOMBER
Chicago, IL 60603-5803			3713	9
			DATE MAILED: 10/23/2003	. /

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

,	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Advisory Action	09/964,060	BAERLOCHER, ANTHONY			
,. , ,	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Aaron L Enatsky	3713			
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ress		
THE REPLY FILED 10 October 2003 FAILS TO PLACE Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1 condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appel Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	void abandonment of this applice i) a timely filed amendment whi	cation. A proper rep ch places the applic	oly to a cation in		
PERIOD FOR RE	PLY [check either a) or b)]				
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing of the period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Adverse, will the statutory period for reply expire later the ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The data was been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extensions of the shortened by above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three models.	isory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the an SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE te on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.1 sion and the corresponding amount of the statutory period for reply originally set in	f the final rejection. E FINAL REJECTION. \$ I 36(a) and the appropriate exite. The appropriate exite final Office action; or	See MPEP e extension fee tension fee under (2) as set forth in		
arned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). 1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant'. 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CF					
2. ■ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered b		or the appear.			
		see NOTF below):			
 (a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below); (b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below); 					
(c) ⊠ they are not deemed to place the application issues for appeal; and/or	·	erially reducing or	simplifying the		
(d) they present additional claims without cancel	ing a corresponding number of	finally rejected clair	ms.		
NOTE: See Continuation Sheet.					
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject	ction(s):				
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s). 	be allowable if submitted in a s	separate, timely file	d amendment		
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for application in condition for allowance because:		sidered but does No	OT place the		
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered be raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	cause it is not directed SOLELY	to issues which we	ere newly		
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims w			and an		
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:					
Claim(s) allowed:					
Claim(s) objected to:					
Claim(s) rejected:					
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:	_				
8. The proposed drawing correction filed on is	a) approved or b) disap	proved by the Exan	niner.		
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Stateme	nt(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s).	1/00			
10. Other:	Supervisory	a Walberg Petent Examiner up 3700			

Continuation Sheet (PTOL-303) 09/964,060

Application No.

Continuation of 2. NOTE: Applicant's claims currently do not distinguish over cited prior art. Applicant's underlying game is directed towards a memory matching game where a payout is provided to a player depending on a player's ability to successfully complete a match. Examiner's rejection describes the elements of a game using the matching concept to provide additional monetary winnings to a player. The arguments towards the potential awards are unpersuasive as successive games are based on a predefined payback percentage that over time remains the same. And a reward is chosen using two random number generators or one, the payback percentage will be fixed according to gaming regulation or dictated by casino rules.